



Cen  
UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/805,626	03/13/2001	Mingjing Li	MS1-725US	3014
22801	7590	12/04/2003	EXAMINER	
LEE & HAYES PLLC 421 W RIVERSIDE AVENUE SUITE 500 SPOKANE, WA 99201			THAI, HANH B	
		ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER
		2171		7
DATE MAILED: 12/04/2003				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Advisory Action</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/805,626	LI ET AL.
	Examiner Hanh B Thai	Art Unit 2171

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 17 November 2003 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

**PERIOD FOR REPLY** [check either a) or b)]

- a)  The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b)  The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1.  A Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2.  The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
  - (a)  they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
  - (b)  they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
  - (c)  they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
  - (d)  they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_.

3.  Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.
4.  Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5.  The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.
6.  The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7.  For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) will not be entered or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) rejected: 1-54.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_.

8.  The drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_ is a) approved or b) disapproved by the Examiner.

9.  Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)( PTO-1449) Paper No(s). 5.

10.  Other: \_\_\_\_\_.



Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's response to the "response to arguments" filed November 17, 2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Regarding claim 40, applicant argues that "the arrangement shown and described by Marchisio (US 6,510,406) is not the same arrangement as claim 40" (response 11/17/03, page 18). In response, the system of Marchisio discloses the collection document module (27, Fig.2, Marchisio) being coupled to the feature extraction modules 21 of Marchisio receiving input documents. Clearly, web documents could be any media content source. Further, the documents of Marchisio are the form of categorization of speech (see col. 18, lines 54-57, Marchisio) and digital speech (see col. 19, lines 10-13, Marchisio) which are media content. And the collection of media content pieces must be done by the process of comparing the content of a current document set to some earlier document set to determine or summarize conceptual in a conversation (see col. 18, lines 56-61, Marchisio). As discussed, the web document contains the media content. The extraction from document includes the extraction from media content piece, and the indexing module 20 of Marchisio is being coupled to generate a query vector "text feature vector" (see col. 5, lines 8-14, col. 6, lines 35-38, Marchisio) based on these extracted text features. Therefore, Marchisio discloses the claimed limitations of claim 40.

Applicant argues that the final office action (mailed in October) is contradicted to the previous office action. In response, examiner merely elaborated on the feature claimed by pointing to the equivalent feature taught by the references.

Applicant argues that Marchisio does not teach "feature vector, which is compared with the query vector". Examiner respectively disagrees. Marchisio teach the dimension feature document (see Fig.4, Marchisio), which corresponds to the feature vectors as defined in the Specification, page 14, is a set of words. And Marchisio teaches the text feature vector associated with the plurality of media content pieces as discussed above. Further, Marchisio teach comparing the query vector to the document (see col4, lines 54-47 and col.6, lines 35-38, marchisio) that is text features associated with the plurality of media content pieces.

Applicant argues that neither Marchisio nor Hoffert (US 6,282,549) discloses "receiving user feedback regarding the relevance of the identified media content pieces". Examiner respectively disagrees. Marchisio teach the comparing queries to documents and the incorporating relevance feedback from the user (see col. 4, lines 56-57). As discussed, web documents could be any media content source. The feedback on the expansion for the query (see col. 15, lines 57-59, Marchisio) and the similar document to a list of documents that are relevant to a paragraph selection in the page (see col. 16, lines 52-56, Marchisio) are the examples of user feedback regarding the relevance of the identified documents of media content pieces.